

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

In the September 24, 2003, Final Rejection, the Examiner rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Janssen et al. patent publication in view of Lu et al. (USPN 5,764,324).

As indicated above, claims 16-18 have been cancelled; new claims 19-22 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, it is believed that new claims 19-22 patentably distinguish over the Janssen et al./Lu et al. reference combination.

Applicant's new independent claim 19 recites a silicon-backed microdisplay that includes a silicon side and a glass side and which improves the work function balance of the device. More specifically, new independent claim 19 recites that the silicon side of the microdisplay includes a silicon substrate, a silicon-side conductive layer disposed on the silicon substrate, and a silicon-side passivation layer, between 2000-6000 angstroms thick, disposed on the silicon-side conductive layer. The glass side of the claim 19 microdisplay comprises a cover glass, a glass-side conductive layer disposed on the cover glass, and a glass-side passivation layer that is 300-900 angstroms thick and comprises a material selected from a group of oxides listed in claim 19. That is, new independent claim 19 defines a silicon-backed microdisplay that has a silicon side having specific physical characteristics and a glass side also having specific physical characteristics, the combination of specific physical characteristics resulting in a work function balance that is in the range of approximately 0.2-0.4eV, an improvement over the conventional work balance function for silicon-backed microdisplay devices.

Upon careful review of the both the Janssen et al. patent publication and the Lu et al. patent, Applicant is of the good faith belief that the references, whether considered individually or in combination, neither teach nor suggest a silicon-backed microdisplay device having the work function balance recited in Applicant's new independent claim 19.

Furthermore, Applicant's new dependent claims recite further specific feature of the claim 19 microdisplay device that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. For example, new claim 22 recites that the glass-side conductive layer includes Indium-tin-oxide, has a characteristic resistance in the range of 100-500 ohms/square and a light transmissivity of 90% or greater. New claim 23 recites that the combination of the glass-side passivation layer and the glass-side conductive layer has an overall transmissivity of 90% or greater and a reflectivity of less than 1%.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that all claims currently pending in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Therefore, it is requested that this amendment be entered and that the application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: January 23, 2004

By: Michael J. Pollock
Michael J. Pollock
Reg. No. 29,098

Attorneys for Applicant(s)